

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION

**52 SOLUTIONS, LLC,**

Plaintiff,

vs.

**JEFFERSON BEACH YACHT  
SALES, INC. et al.,**

Defendants.

**2:19-CV-13172-TGB**

**ORDER DENYING MOTION  
TO APPEAR PRO HAC VICE**

On January 21, 2020, local counsel for Defendants Absolute S.P.A. and Absolute of Americas, Inc. (“Absolute entities”) filed a motion for temporary admission, pro hac vice, for California attorneys Stefano Abbasciano and Antonio Valla. ECF No. 32.

Defendants contend that pro hac vice admittance is necessary for “the purpose of their participation in discovery, depositions, motions, settlement, pre-trial conferences and, if necessary, the trial of this matter.” ECF No. 32, PageID.883. Defendants assert that the participation of attorneys Abbasciano and Valla is particularly important

to their client because Abbasciano and Valla are native Italian speakers and the Absolute entities are Italian businesses. *Id.*

The general rule in this district is that pro hac vice admission is not permitted. E.D. Mich. L.R. 83.20(c)(1). The Court may only grant exceptions under Local Rule 83.20(f) “[o]n application.” Even without admittance, however, “an actively-licensed attorney who is not under suspension or disbarment in this or another federal or state court may . . . cosign papers or participate in pretrial conferences in conjunction with a member of the bar of this court . . . represent a client in a deposition . . . [and] counsel a client in an action or proceeding pending in this court.” E.D. Mich. L.R. 83.20(i)(1)(D)(i)–(iii).

Under the local rules therefore, attorneys Abbasciano and Valla already have the ability, short of appearing at trial, to assist their clients in these proceedings as long as they continue to maintain local counsel. They need not seek pro hac vice admission to undertake the services contemplated; consequently there is no need to request the Court’s permission. In the event of a trial, Abbasciano and Valla make seek admission to practice before this Court. Accordingly, Defendants have not shown good cause as to why the Court should make an exception to

the general local rule disfavoring pro hac vice representation at this time. *See, e.g., Belle v. Sunbeam Prod., Inc.*, No. 09-CV-13902, 2009 WL 3757059, at \*1 (E.D. Mich. Nov. 9, 2009).

For the reasons above, the Absolute Defendants' Motion for Temporary Admission Pro Hac Vice of California Attorneys Antonio Valla and Stefano Abbasciano (ECF No. 32) is **DENIED without prejudice**.

DATED this 10th day of March, 2020.

BY THE COURT:

/s/Terrence G. Berg

TERRENCE G. BERG

United States District Judge